IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO : 14259 of 2004

Between:

Vasantha Chinnapa Reddy, S/o.Gangi Reddy,
R/o.37/26, (Old No.14/14), Sanjeevanagar colony,
Rayachoti Town, Kadapah Dist.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Superintendent of police, Kadapa, Kadapa District.
2 The Circle Inspector of police, Rayachoti Town P.S., Kadapa District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the respondents in interfering with the peaceful possession of the petitioner's suit house (upstair protion) at D.No. 37/26 (old No.14/14) situated at Sanjeevanagar colony, Rayachoti Town, Kadapah District and consequently direct the respondents not to interfere with the petitioner's peaceful possession and enjoyment of house (up stair portion) at D.No.37/26 (old No.14/14) Sanjeevanagar Colony, Rayachoti Town, Kadapa District.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.D.RAGHAVA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

In this writ petition, the petitioner seeks a writ of Mandamus declaring the alleged action of the respondents in interfering with the peaceful possession of the petitioner's house (upstair portion) at D.No.37/26 (old No.14/14) situated at Sanjeevanagar Colony, Rayachoti Town, Kadapa District, as arbitrary and illegal.

On behalf of the respondents, the Inspector of Police, Rayachoti (Urban) Police Station, Kadapa District, filed a counter affidavit dated 23-08-2004, denying the allegations made by the petitioner and stating that the respondents have never interfered with the civil disputes of the petitioner and the 3rd parties in respect of the property in question at any point of time.

In the light of the unrebutted averments in the counter affidavit, no further adjudication is necessary. Accordingly, recording the statement of the respondents in the counter affidavit, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

_____

27-10-2004

vs

To

1. The Superintendent of Police, Kadapa, Kadapa District.

2. The Circle Inspector of Police, Rayachoti Town Police Station, Kadapa District.

3. 2CCs to the G.P for Home, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad(O.U.T)

4. 2CD copies